

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 30, 2001

LB 451, 640

Governor, and I really do appreciate what the Governor has done. He has put dollars into the juvenile justice system through LB 640 and he has hired some...already some probation officers, and we were desperately short of those, so I applaud him on what he has done. If it wasn't for the fact that I really feel that we can save dollars by passing of LB 451, I would not be voting to override. But with that in mind, I will on this particular issue vote to override LB 451. I'll return the rest of my time back to the Chair. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Jensen. The speaking order is as follows: Senator Brown, followed by Senator Landis, Hilgert, Dwite Pedersen, Aguilar, Senators Bromm, Beutler, Cunningham, Thompson. Senator Brown.

SENATOR BROWN: Mr. President, members, it is clear from everything that we know, and certainly from the material that we've received, that if we do the correct kind of intake, we're going to have less detention for young people and more appropriate kinds of detention, in that the appropriate kids are going to be detained and other kids who can be dealt with in a less restrictive manner, can be dealt with less restrictively. But it all depends on the two aspects of intake--the appropriateness of what we're doing with the kids, and the timeliness of it. And so what we're talking...I guess we're talking about two things that are related and yet possibly not necessarily related. The validity of the screening instrument, whether that is going to give us the appropriate kinds of decisions in terms of detention, but then the other aspect, the timeliness, I'm not certain which way I believe is best. Whether it's best to do it the way that it has been proposed in LB 451, or in what the Governor suggested in the override...I mean in the veto message. Because we're talking about six officers currently or seven officers currently doing intake, and now adding six more to have that be thirteen officers doing intake. Is that a better way to get timeliness? Or is it better to have all the probation officers trained to be able to do the intake aspect so that whoever is most available when the youth is arrested can respond appropriately to whatever the background of that individual is. And I have been told, and I don't know that this is true, and maybe Senator Thompson could